

REMARKS

In response to the species election requirement, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to make them generic (in the same way that claims 5-7 are already generic as indicated by the examiner in the office action.) By amending claims 1-2, Applicant has removed the claims directed to the different species pursuant to MPEP 818.02(c) and therefore, in response to the species election requirement, Application elects the species that is readable on claim 1-12 with claims 1-12 being generic.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12 are allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner and early allowance of these claims and the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER LLP US

Dated: July 21, 2010_____

By /Timothy W. Lohse/_____
Timothy W. Lohse
Reg. No. 35,255
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER LLP US
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 833-2055